REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed August 28, 2007. Claims 1-5 are amended and claims 6, 9-11, and 14 are cancelled. Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 12-13 remain pending in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. The remarks or lack of remarks are not to be construed as an admission regarding the Examiner's construction or interpretation of the cited art. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 3,530,479 (*Waldron*) in view of Applicant's Admitted prior Art (AAPA). Claims 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Waldron* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,087,921 (*Kurtz*). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Waldron* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,152 (*Glabe*).

Applicant's traverse the Examiner's rejections for obviousness at least on the grounds that the references – either individually or in combination – fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims. Further, Applicant suggests that there is no reason to combine the references.

Embodiments of the invention relate to a shielding plate for a component such as an optical transceiver. Because the component can operate at high frequencies, the electromagnetic waves emitted can be disruptive, particularly when the emissions are into the surroundings rather than inside a metallic structure. Embodiments of the

invention advantageously reduce emissions of disruptive electromagnetic waves outside of the metallic structure.

The arrangement of claim 1 is fundamentally different from the cited art. Claim 1 requires, for example, that the first region to be disposed inside a metallic structure. Thus, any emissions that are coupled out of the shielding plate body are contained by the metallic structure. This structure is not taught or suggested by *Waldron*, which does not teach or suggest a metallic structure to contain the emission of electromagnetic waves. *Waldron*, in fact, appears to suggest that the emission of electromagnetic waves should not be contained, but should be radiated. A waveguide aerial, is a type of antenna. Thus a waveguide aerial appears to teach away from claim 1, which claims a shielding plate.

Claim 1 has been further amended to clarify that the plurality of wall sections include "a rear wall, a first side wall, a second side wall, and an upper side wall that connects at longitudinal edges of the first side wall and the second side wall, wherein the rear wall connects with the first side wall, the second side wall and the upper side wall and at least partially closes the first region of the shielding plate body inside the metallic structure."

A rear wall that connects with the first side wall, the second side wall and the upper side wall and at least partially closes the first region of the shielding plate body inside the metallic structure is not taught or suggested by the cited art. For example, *Waldron* does not appear to illustrate or discuss a rear wall that partially closes the first region. Figures 1-3 of *Waldron* and the accompanying description do not illustrate or describe, teach or suggest a rear wall as required by claim 1.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion that the electromagnetic waves coupled out through the slot antennas are contained by the metallic structure. *Waldron* is intended to radiate, not contain, electromagnetic waves.

Claim 5 has also been amended to recite that at least one slot antenna extends between and touches the opposite longitudinal edges of the first and second side wall sections. This requirement is not taught or suggested by the cited art. *Waldron*, for example, suggests that the distance of the slot from the edges of the wall should vary sinusoidally. This does not teach or suggest a slot antenna that extends between

opposite longitudinal edges of the first and second side wall sections as required by claim 1. Such a slot does not vary sinusoidally.

Applicant further submits that there must be some reason to combine references in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As noted in the specification, spurious emission can cause unwanted problems. In fact, it is known to seal the shielding plate as much as possible in order to avoid these types of emissions. *Waldron*, in contrast, purports to provide an improved aerial that has a bandwidth of about 30%. *Waldron* desires to increase emissions. Applicant respectfully submits that one of skill in the art would not look to the teachings of *Waldron* (which describes an aerial) because *Waldron's* desire to radiate is in contrast with the purpose of a shielding plate, which shields electromagnetic radiation.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied art. Because claim 1 is patentable, the claims rejected over *Waldron* in view *Kurtz* (claims 2 and 6) and over *Waldron* in view of *Glabe* (claim 7) are also patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 31st day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl T. Reed/ Reg. #45454
CARL T. REED

CARL T. REED
Registration No. 45,454
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

W:\16274\37B.1\MJW0000001765V001.doc